

Kristin Alexander

From: Justin Weir [jweir66@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 9:31 PM
To: Planning Department
Cc: Julie Weir; quinnkat@verizon.net
Subject: Proposed Craig Rd. Monopole

Acton Planning Board Members,

My name is Justin Weir, and I live at 305 School St, in direct view of the site of the proposed Craig Road monopole. The proposed tower will lie at the center of the picture window of my living room, so my property value will take a serious hit if it is built. I ask that you consider the potential loss in value for my home and others in the area and deny this application. At the very least, you should only approve a much smaller tower. As I will explain below, the in-home data services that require its excessive height are not only redundant, but also inferior to existing services in the area. In addition, I ask that you require them to plant mature trees to screen the electronics at the base of the tower rather than allowing them to plant 4 foot saplings which will take years to have any effect.

At the previous meeting, we heard several claims that there are gaps in coverage that the tower would fill, but I believe these claims are merely an attempt to justify the construction of a commodity for the tower company, SBA Towers II. Several towers are clearly visible from the proposed site, so I suspect that the two companies claiming coverage gaps, T-Mobile and ClearWire, haven't made honest attempts at collocation in order to bolster their relationship with SBA. More importantly, the coverage gaps clearly do not exist. I am a T-Mobile customer, and my coverage is excellent, just as their website claims it is at this location. I get a usable signal in my basement and full bars all along Rt. 2. I have provided photographic evidence in this e-mail that the coverage maps submitted by T-Mobile are in error. ClearWire currently has no coverage in the area at all, so their gap is only a theoretical future gap, which should not be enough to justify the loss in property value that this tower will cause.

Even if you give some level of approval to SBA, you should not allow them to construct a tower this excessively large. The ClearWire reps said that the tower needed to be larger than normal because they needed stronger signals in order to provide internet service inside nearby buildings. This is ridiculous for two reasons. Firstly, there are very few homes actually in the supposed gap. The bulk of the alleged gap is highway, forest, soccer fields, and farm land. Second, the in-home data services that ClearWire intends to provide offer no benefit to consumers over the existing internet infrastructure provided by Comcast and Verizon. It's roughly the same price as those services, except that it's slower both in terms of throughput and responsiveness. The inherent weaknesses of wireless technology also make it less reliable overall and unlikely to keep up with rapidly rising bandwidth demands.

ClearWire is attempting to deploy a product, WiMax, which has to this date failed to prove itself viable in the marketplace. I believe that SBA Towers II is using ClearWire's impending product launch as cover for a strategic land grab. Ownership of such an oversized tower at this location would be very lucrative for SBA, but it would come at the expense of the citizens of Acton who live in the surrounding streets.

Thank you for your time,
Justin Weir

PS: I've attached 4 pictures which demonstrate that T-Mobile's coverage map is incorrect. The first two demonstrate that I was able to receive a call on my cell phone in my basement with 2 bars, despite being underground. The second two show my phone next to a GPS unit to demonstrate that my cheap old phone gets 4 bars inside my car at the center of where T-Mobile claims there is no "in vehicle" coverage.







